REMARKS

Claims 6-8 are pending herein.

I. The anticipation rejections of claims 1-5 based on Nagasaka (US 5,333,246), as noted on page 2 of the Office Action.

The USPTO respectfully rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagasaka. Applicants respectfully note that claims 1-5 have been cancelled. Applicants further respectfully note that the Nagasaka reference will be discussed with reference to new claims 6-8 as explained in detail below.

II. New claims 6-8.

Applicants respectfully note that new claims 6-8 have been added. No new matter is added by the amendments. Support for the new claims is found in original claims 1-5 and throughout the present specification, particularly on pages 10-12 and 16-18 of the present specification, and in present Figures 1, 2, and 5.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully note that they are respectfully aware of the Nagasaka reference, and that the subject matter of the present application is respectfully an improvement over the conventional structure taught in Nagasaka. For example, on pages 1-3 of the present specification, Applicants respectfully address Japanese Patent No. 3,168,580, which is the corresponding Japanese version of the presently cited Nagasaka reference. Also, for the Examiner's convenience, Applicants respectfully note the following information regarding the Nagasaka reference in view of the new claims.

A. Nagasaka does not disclose that when a predetermined condition occurs in mid-course of the rasterization processing, the image data transmitting section transmits the image data and a completed part of the pixel data to another image processing apparatus, so that the other image processing apparatus conducts a continuation of rasterization processing for the image data, as claimed in independent claim 6.

Independent claims 6 claims in relevant part:

"wherein, when a predetermined condition occurs **in mid-course of the rasterization processing** conducted by the rasterization processing section, the image data transmitting section **transmits the image data and a completed-**

part of the pixel data, for which the rasterization processing have been completed by that time, **to the other image processing apparatus**, so that the other image processing apparatus conducts **a continuation of the rasterization processing** for the image data." (**emphasis added**)

No new matter is added by the amendments. Support for the amendments is found in present Figure 5 and on page 17, lines 5-23 of the present specification. Regarding these limitations, it is respectfully not seen where Nagasaka discloses the claimed structure quoted above.

For example, the USPTO respectfully argues on page 3 of the Office Action regarding claim 1 that "the computer 6a [of Nagasaka] which generates a printing request distributes the PDL translation processing to all the computers 6a, 6b, and 6c so that the picture element formation can be executed by the parallel processing of these plural computers." However, it is respectfully important to note that **Nagasaka does not disclose that any of computers 6a, 6b, or 6c can transmit image data and a completed part of the pixel data to another computer in mid-course of the rasterization processing**, as claimed in claim 6.

In particular, Nagasaka discloses at column 4, lines 14-20 that "the translating program divides the source file into small files that can be handled independently and converts the small files into printing picture elements by sharing the respective small file processing with other processors." Additionally, as noted in column 7, lines 31-34 of Nagasaka, "these picture element data are synthesized (or combined) by a picture element synthesize processing 220 to complete printing processing data."

In other words, in Nagasaka, the source file is divided into smaller files, and each of these smaller files are distributed in their entirety to computers such as 6a, 6b, and 6c of Nagasaka. After the computers 6a, 6b, 6c finish processing (i.e., rasterizing) a particular smaller file, its sends the picture element data to be combined with other picture element data generated from other smaller files. It is respectfully important to note that **Nagasaka does not disclose that a computer can transfer one of these smaller files to another computer in mid-course of the rasterization processing, so that the other computer can conduct a continuation of the rasterization processing for the image data**, as claimed in claim 6.

In contrast, present Figure 1 illustrates one possible embodiment of the claimed structure quoted above. For example, present Figure 1 shows a plurality of image processing

apparatuses 3, 4, 5 connected to each other and to an information processing apparatus 1 and image printing apparatus 2 through a network 6. As explained on page 17 of the present specification, certain predetermined conditions may make it impossible for a particular image processing apparatus to continue processing, such as the receiving of another print job, the workload becomes too heavy, or other appropriate conditions. When such a condition occurs, **the image processing apparatus that was rasterizing the file is structured to transmit the pixel information for the partial rasterization processing to another image processing apparatus.** In other words, when a first image processing apparatus is interrupted during the rasterization process, the partially rasterized file is transferred to a second image processing apparatus. **The second image processing apparatus then continues to rasterize the partially rasterized file** (see also page 18, lines 1-8 of the present specification). In other words, the second image processing apparatus conducts a continuation of the rasterization processing, as claimed in claim 6.

The distinction noted above is important and non-trivial because it results in significant advantages over conventional systems. For example, in a conventional parallel processing system such as in Nagasaka, the dividing process and the synthesizing process are indispensable. In contrast, **the system of claim 6 allows the processing load to be shared without requiring that the specific print job be divided into smaller unit jobs and later synthesized together.** Overall, the system of claim 6 allows for increased speed of printing operation due to shared processing load without requiring system resources to be spent on dividing and synthesizing print job files.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that Nagasaka does not disclose all of the limitations of independent claim 6. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 6 is allowable over Nagasaka.

B. Dependent claims 7-8

As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claims 6 is allowable, and therefore it is further respectfully asserted that dependent claims 7 and 8 are also allowable.

III. Conclusion.

Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Please contact the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner including via telephone if convenient for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

By__/Daniel P. Lent/_____

Daniel P. Lent
Registration No. 44,867

Date: February 27, 2008
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413